

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

MARGARET ANN JOHNSSON,)	
)	
Appellant,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 16 C 1865
)	
CATHERINE STEEGE, not individually but)	
as chapter 7 Trustee of the bankruptcy estate)	
of Margaret Ann Johnsson,)	
)	
Appellee.)	

MEMORANDUM ORDER

When the Motion To Dismiss Appeal For Lack of Jurisdiction in this case ("the Motion," Dkt. No. 6) was called for presentment at today's motion call, only the counsel for movant Catherine Steege ("Steege") stepped forward. This Court then granted the Motion orally because of its obvious merit, only to learn later in the morning that pro se plaintiff Margaret Ann Johnsson ("Johnsson") had been occupied on another matter before this Court's colleague Honorable John Tharp at the time of this Court's motion call.

When Johnsson did appear at about 10 a.m., this Court had its court reporter print out the transcript of the brief 9:15 a.m. hearing so that this Court could repeat orally to Johnsson the content of its earlier ruling. Accordingly a copy of that transcript has been attached to and made a part of this memorandum order, which therefore needs to memorialize only the ordering portions of its ruling:

1. Appellee Steege's Motion To Dismiss Johnsson's appeal for lack of jurisdiction is granted.

2. Johnsson is ordered to appear in court at 9 a.m. March 10, 2016 to show cause why her conduct in bringing this appeal, particularly in light of her extensive and non-meritorious litigation history of a similar nature referred to in Steege's Motion To Dismiss, has not violated Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(b).



Milton I. Shadur
Senior United States District Judge

Date: February 25, 2016

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

MARGARET ANN JOHNSON,	No. 16 C 1865
Appellant,	Chicago, Illinois
-vs-	February 25, 2016
CATHERINE L. STEEGE,	9:35 o'clock a.m.
Appellee.	

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS - MOTION
BEFORE THE HONORABLE MILTON I. SHADUR

APPEARANCES:

For the Appellee: JENNER & BLOCK
BY: MR. LANDON S. RAIFORD
353 North Clark Street
Chicago, Illinois 60654

Court Reporter: ROSEMARY SCARPELLI
219 South Dearborn Street
Room 2304A
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 435-5815

1 THE CLERK: 16 C 1865, Johnsson versus Steege.

2 MR. RAIFORD: Good morning, your Honor, Landon
3 Raiford for the appellee Miss Steege.

4 THE COURT: Do you have a phone number or some way
5 to reach Miss Johnson?

6 MR. RAIFORD: Off the top of my head I do not, no.

7 THE COURT: Wait just a minute. I see your
8 certificate of service just was for her residence address.
9 Let me take a look here. Well, I do not have anything in
10 terms of the ability to reach her, because the only thing
11 that has been listed here is her address that you transmitted
12 notices to.

13 And this case is extraordinarily disturbing.
14 Nobody up to now apparently has called a halt to the clear
15 abuse of the judicial system that this person has engaged in.
16 Page 2 of your motion lists no fewer than eight separate
17 appeals that she has taken from orders of a bankruptcy judge,
18 and three of those have been dismissed for lack of
19 jurisdiction.

20 This appeal relates to a motion in limine, and by
21 its very nature it is not a final order and, therefore, not
22 appealable. When I mentioned three instances of having
23 dismissed appeals for lack of jurisdiction, it reminded me of
24 the saying that "if three people tell you you're drunk, you
25 might as well lie down," and she has not lain down.

1 Accordingly this has to be viewed as a filing in
2 bad faith. It brings, I think, Federal Rule of Civil
3 Procedure 11 into play. I am granting the motion to dismiss
4 the appeal for lack of jurisdiction, but as you know the
5 Court does continue to have jurisdiction for purposes of
6 considering whether sanctions are appropriate.

7 One possible sanction of course would be to put her
8 on a restricted filer list, and that seems long overdue.
9 That is up to the Executive Committee. But as far as I am
10 concerned, I also had in mind that she has imposed costs on
11 somebody such as you, who come in as a movant on behalf of
12 Miss Steege.

13 So the order is I am granting the motion to dismiss
14 for want of subject matter jurisdiction, and I am going to
15 order Miss Johnson to come into court to show cause why her
16 conduct in this case has not violated Rule 11(b). And she is
17 ordered to come into court at 9 o'clock on Thursday March
18 10th.

19 Failure to appear will result -- the order should
20 show this -- will result in the Marshals being instructed to
21 bring her into court. People simply can't abuse the system
22 in this fashion. And you know all of us have enough to do,
23 and lawyers have enough to do, not to put up with this kind
24 of stuff. So that is the order.

25 MR. RAIFORD: I appreciate that. Thank you, your

1 Honor.

2 THE COURT: Thank you. And by the way, I am not
3 ruling on your ability to seek sanctions. That is entirely
4 within your province, but I am talking about the Court's
5 determination.

6 MR. RAIFORD: Understood.

7 THE COURT: Thank you.

8 (Which were all the proceedings heard.)

9 CERTIFICATE

10 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
11 from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

13 s/Rosemary Scarpellri/

14 Date: February 25, 2016

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25